

1962

Approved For Release 2000/08/25 : CIA-RDP75-00001R000200020021-1

OCT 10 1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE

21865

Additional proposed legislation.

4. Sources of information will include:
National management association source materials as made available.
Journals and magazines.

Newspaper reports and news items.

Published and unpublished theses.

Books.

Court decisions and records.

Decisions and reports of relevant government boards and commissions.

Arbitration awards.

Congressional and State legislative reports and evaluations as made available.

Personal interviewing and programming.

5. Materials collected may be useful to parties interested in action programs related to answering the abuse of union power. Such materials are also expected to become a rich source of materials for writing in the field. The research program itself is not intended to produce specific books, monographs or articles; yet the writer, and others making use of information secured, can be expected to prepare materials for publication on the strength of such information.

6. In process of such collection and evaluation of material, it is expected that there will be developed a comprehensive and detailed topical outline; in time and as the project so requires, information retrieval devices for quick access to information in the specific areas; an evaluation of information sources; and a method for continuing acquisition, collation, evaluation, and reporting of up-to-date information.

7. It is expected that the program will, during this year, produce in comprehensiveness, depth and detail, information sources substantially superior in content, methods of evaluation, availability, and outline analysis, to anything which has been attempted to date; and all that is produced during the current year becomes a base upon which to build for information retrieval and reporting in the years ahead.

To accomplish the foregoing, a supplemental budget allowance is required, commencing immediately and extending to the end of the calendar year.

An approach of this nature is indispensable to the ultimate success of any program that may be designed to reach a realistic solution to the problem. Absent the foregoing, it will be necessary for the business community to continue to rely upon the preachment of platitudes. There does not now exist satisfactory capacity to support those legislators who have introduced bills to correct the abuses of organized labor.

Labor organizations have set aside, through their vast research divisions, sums in the high six figures to prevent inroads upon their monopoly position. This, of course, does not include the \$2,500,000 currently being expended by unions for short courses on college campuses during the summer months of 1962, nor funds used for political purposes.

It should be recognized that this is a continuing program and will require further, but lesser, resources over a period of several years. In this connection, it should not be overlooked that the industrial relations division, through its annual institutes, has made available a fund of \$25,000 net, and has produced during the past 18 months approximately \$60,000 gross, from industrial relations clinics conducted by its vice president. The expense of this latter program is minimal and is in any event more than offset by increased revenue from renewal, increase, and new membership.

All of the several programs which the industrial relations division provides for the field are on a self-sustaining basis. The literature which it distributes has returned many times its cost through minimal charges that are made. Furthermore, it will not be overlooked that much of the amount re-

quested for this budget has been saved this year through a streamlining of the staff. The contemplated replacements should not increase the revised budgetary limitations.

RANSOM FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I feel compelled to rise today even at this late hour to raise my voice in objection, which I did yesterday and have done before for nearly 2 years now, to the abortive proposal of the tractors-for-prisoners deal and now the \$62 million Cuban prisoner deal in the name of ransom because it is nothing more and no less than blackmail. The insulting proposals of Fidel Castro and his constant demands, extravagant demands, which he has repeated again just the other day, demanding \$62 million—now \$60 million—\$2 million has been paid, this \$62 million demand made by him in the name of indemnity for repayment for damages done in the abortive invasion in the Bay of Pigs.

I introduced a resolution in 1961 which stated very clearly by position in opposition to the tractors-for-prisoners abortive proposal. Finally, the administration itself withdrew its support on that particular proposition. Shortly thereafter, however, a new proposal was made in early 1962. This was not for tractors. This was not for \$25 million worth of tractors as indemnity and ransom and blackmail. This was for \$62 million—dollars—spendable American dollars was demanded. I brought out on the floor of the House, and it is in the Record, that earlier, this demand being made in 1962, that earlier even before the demand was made, the administration had been giving consideration to and had issued an order, a preliminary regulation of the Internal Revenue Service, on December 6, 1961, to the effect that contributions to the Cuban Family Committee would be tax deductible. Now this was as far back as 1961, December, even before Fidel Castro made his money demand, changing it from tractors to money. And during a period after it was publicly announced by the President that the United States was withdrawing any support of the tractor deal.

There is not any question but what the administration has directly or indirectly been working hand in hand with Fidel Castro in an effort to get the prisoners released by negotiating for the paying of ransom of some sort, and it appears obvious as an effort to apologize for the mistakes made by the administration in the invasion of the Bay of Pigs. This was probably the most serious mistake and one of the blackest blotsches in the history of this country, the refusal and failure of the President of the United States to provide air cover in order that the invasion could be successful.

Now in an effort to bail out the administration because of the mistake,

Ferd J. O'DONOVAN
x Joe J. Donahue
1962
Ferd J. C. CRAMER
1962
21865

there is this second abortive proposal, and now for the first time in the history of this country ransom is being negotiated to be paid to an enemy government. For the first time in the history of this country a ransom and indemnity is being negotiated with Fidel Castro, which the Nation has already stated through this legislative body as being the head of an enemy government, a Communist government, in the Cuban resolution passed by the House recently.

The administration is still negotiating the payment of indemnity to that enemy Communist government. How silly we must look. How silly we must look in the eyes of the people of the free world, let alone how weak and vacillating to the Communist governments. How silly we must look in the eyes of all the world in condoning these ransom negotiations when this body passed a resolution of recent date—Public Law 87-733—demanding strong action on the part of the administration, saying we will back the President in any efforts necessary, that the United States is "determined"—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.

Approved October 3, 1962.

Are we working toward the realization of the aspirations of freedom-loving Cubans, for the Cuban people themselves to achieve their self-determination when what we do is to make available to Fidel Castro badly needed, according to the latest press releases, foodstuffs, paid for by American taxpayers, foodstuffs to Fidel Castro which he needs as badly as he needs military materiel, and perhaps even worse? It is common knowledge that his efforts in agrarian reform and providing agricultural products for his people are a dismal failure. And so we are bailing him out of his failure, and at the same time compounding the failure of the administration in the Bay of Pigs invasion by paying indemnity.

This House has spoken further in the Mutual Security Act, and in no uncertain terms. How foolish we must look, Madam Speaker, in the eyes of other freedom-loving nations that we are asking to refrain from trading with Cuba, not only military materiel but all trade with Cuba. We passed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act—I have it before me now—to the effect that—

None of the funds provided in this bill shall be available for assistance to any country the government of which sells arms, munitions, or implements of war to the Castro regime, or which furnishes any sort of aid, either military or economic, to the regime.

We also provided for the cutting off of funds to any country that trades with Castro, and with the Communists in Cuba or in this hemisphere.

Approved For Release 2000/08/25 : CIA-RDP75-00001R000200020021-1

This Government has spoken through Congress twice in unequivocal terms.

In the last consideration of the question of money or dollars for Castro I introduced a resolution in strong opposition to it, House Concurrent Resolution 459, on April 11, 1962. This was after I discovered that the Internal Revenue Service had already issued a preliminary order on December 6, 1961, that was then in effect based upon which contributions to this Cuban Family Committee were tax deductible.

I introduce an amendment to the mutual security bill which barely failed, which would have put this ransom proposal in its proper resting place—the ash can. It barely failed by a vote of 134 to 137, and it barely failed not because of a single Member on the Republican side voting against it. I was amazed at the offer by Mr. Donovan of ransom for the Cuban prisoners in the amount of \$60 million or for foodstuffs which can be interpreted only as an indemnification by this Nation for the overt acts of this Nation. This was through a Mr. Donovan, who happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate. This is a way of playing a little politics at the same time.

This country through its overt acts is consenting to paying or having paid an indemnity to a Communist country—Cuba.

That is blackmail, that is extortion.

This demand for ransom is reminiscent of the days of piracy on the high seas, and repugnant to every principle of decency and self-respect.

This Nation by considering this proposal and authorizing Mr. Donovan to negotiate it is kowtowing to the demands of a Communist dictator, resulting from an imprisonment order handed down through a kangaroo court which resulted in the imprisonment, thus giving recognition to the court itself—an indirect recognition of Castro's Communist government. How can we say we do not recognize Castro on the one hand, and on the other hand recognize and negotiate with Castro through Donovan? This Nation's prestige is sinking in the eyes of the world, and as of this time this giving in to Castro's indemnity and ransom demands can only be interpreted as yielding to and being soft on and conciliatory toward the Communists and communism.

This is the thing I cannot understand. There are thousands more prisoners rotting in Castro's rathole prisons who could be traded and could be made the basis of further demands for further indemnifications from this country or its citizens. Where is the end of it? There are 100,000 of them, it is estimated, in Cuban prisons.

As a matter of fact, as I brought out earlier in the day, based upon a letter received by me from the Department of State dealing with the question, which replied to my inquiry of the State Department as to why they will not recognize the free and non-Communist government in exile to help them win back their own freedom. I could hardly believe the answer I got. But in that answer, in which the excuse was if we did

so—recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile—we would not be able to continue, in effect, to do business with Castro through the Swiss Embassy, go on to say—this is from the letter of March 12, 1962, signed by Mr. Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State:

In addition, there are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison and who can only be reached through the efforts of the Swiss Embassy in Havana.

U.S. citizens are in prison. Where is the compassion for the U.S. citizens that are in prison equal to the compassion being shown by the administration through Mr. Donovan with regard to the Cuban exiles in prison?

No one has more sympathy for them than I—the Cuban prisoners—but everyone in Cuba is a prisoner today. The whole population—millions of them are prisoners. There are also Americans who are prisoners. There are a hundred thousand who are actually incarcerated.

Thousands of Americans lost their lives in the two World Wars and in Korea fighting to uphold the dignity of America and trying to affirm their dedication to freedom. Can we do less here today? Can we compromise away to Castro the causes for which they fought and died?

These are some of the questions and I want to get an answer to them. What right does a private citizen in view of the Logan Act and the Trading With the Enemy Act have in doing business with Fidel Castro after it is stated that this Government finds the Castro Communist regime to be an enemy of this country?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think the gentleman will agree with me that there is certainly a very great difference between the proposals as we have them by rumor and the so-called tractors-for-freedom matter. As I remember, the tractors-for-freedom deal, with which neither the gentleman from Florida nor I agreed, they were to be bought with money collected by private citizens. However, if we can believe the reports which we have had today over the wires, which reports certainly have not been denied by the White House, there is every reason to think there will be taxpayers' money used to pay the ransom for the prisoners of the Bay of Pigs under this particular proposal.

If this is true and if we are actually going to pay from this Government to another government—to a dictator, if you will—for the release of prisoners, there will never be another American released by a dictator or by an enemy for free, will there?

I think the answer is obviously "No." We are starting on a course of action here which will rise to haunt us in the future and which will cause every American, wherever he may be throughout the world, to be in danger of being kidnapped and captured and held for ransom. Once you allow yourself to be stamped

with that stamp which says you are a sucker for and weak enough to give in to ransom, then you will never get through paying until you rise up on your hind legs and solve the problem by physical force.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the question of ransom is not necessarily, in my opinion, whether the ransom is raised through a citizens' committee in the form of American dollars or whether it is a request for funds from the United States. Although I agree there is a differentiation as far as the taxpayers are concerned, because the people should be even more opposed and disturbed over any thought of using the taxpayer's money, their money, whether it be direct or not for payment of ransom to Castro.

Mr. Speaker, I read that there is even some possibility that U.S. cash may be involved, according to the news.

Mr. Speaker, I just read that according to the United Press "there were reports that the Kennedy administration itself was prepared to help finance part of the ransom," but State Department and White House officials declined comment on any aspect of the private negotiations."

Mr. Speaker, I thus also see by the press that this is a cloak-and-dagger operation. This is a very supersecret job. This is one of Bobby Kennedy's quickies under the philosophy of do-it before the people realize what is happening and the shock of realizing it has been done will not be quite so great—politically that is.

Mr. Speaker, I quote further from the UPI release today:

Evidence mounted today that Government officials are playing a behind-the-scenes role in negotiations for the release of 1,113 prisoners in Cuba. Whatever the role may be, it was cloaked in official silence.

Mr. Speaker, is it not the American people's right to know what deal is being cooked up with possibly their money and wealth in the form of foodstuff surpluses or otherwise which is involved in these negotiations?

Mr. Speaker, I quote further:

But there was this evidence to link the Government with efforts, ostensibly initiated by relatives of the prisoners, to free them:

A report that James E. Donovan, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senator from New York and attorney official representing the families of the prisoners, actually was assigned to the negotiator's role last June by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Kennedy said the report—published by the New York World-Telegram and Sun—is untrue, but it was known that Donovan visited the Attorney General several times in recent months.

The American people have been denied any knowledge of these super-secret negotiations on this vital matter, and I ask why?

Permit me to say parenthetically that it was reported in the press just the other day, before his most recent visit, that he visited the Attorney General's office before he went down to Havana to continue negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, quoting further the UPI report today:

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

21867

A Justice spokesman declined to comment on the subject that the prisoner negotiations were discussed during these visits.

On at least one of the visits, Donovan was accompanied by a State Department specialist on Cuban affairs.

Does that not speak for itself? And further quoting:

Some Members of Congress informed on progress of the negotiations indicated that they expect Government funds to be used for part of the cost of effecting the liberation of the prisoners.

I am one of them. I have asked the President of the United States or the Secretary of State to advise me as to whether it is true or not, because all of the press releases indicate it is and I have condemned it. Under what statute and under what law, and what authority is this done, particularly in view of the strong action taken by this body recently, expecting that trade would be cut off and that any aid to Castro would be cut off? We see now that while the administration talks rough, the administration talks tough, when it comes to action it looks like it uses a powder puff. Talk tough and use a powderpuff—in dealing with the Communists seems to be the rule of the New Frontier.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida for raising this issue on the floor of this House, this issue of secret negotiations by a U.S. citizen, a private citizen, Mr. Donovan, with the Castro-Communist Government of Cuba, looking toward the payment of \$60 million of ransom.

I subscribe completely to the gentleman's protest and associate myself in asking for an answer to the questions as to the authority for such negotiations. I oppose any payment of ransom by anyone of any kind through the connivance of our Government, to anyone in Communist Cuba. And secondly, and just as important, I want to join the gentleman's protest to the withholding of facts and information from the American people.

It would be reprehensible it seems to me to keep such negotiations secret until they were an accomplished fact and it was too late for public indignation or congressional action, or anything else, to stop them. As a matter of fact, any such devious plan might so outrage public opinion, it seems to me, that it could well invite a congressional impeachment proceeding.

Madam Speaker, the Secretary of State should make immediately available to the press and to the public a full explanation of what is going on. Certainly no dealings could have been conducted without the aid and support of the Government. And I might say that it is an odd thing—the gentleman mentioned the Attorney General; the situation legally is such that any prosecution under the Logan Act would have to be by the Attorney General. And, indeed, only the President could pardon anyone who breached the law. So this, it seems to

me, is a matter between, you might say, the Kennedy family and the American people.

Madam Speaker, I compliment the gentleman. He has done the right thing in asking that all the facts be given to the American people.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and to comment further; one of the things that is so disturbing to me is this. While these negotiations are going on to pay Castro \$60 million in one form or another to help support his Communist regime—and that is the obvious result of it, it helps to keep him in power—at the very time these negotiations are going on, and inadvertently Mr. Donovan is campaigning for the Senate in New York down in Havana—we find Mr. Dorticos, the President of Cuba, calling upon the United Nations to condemn the United States, with resulting riots around the United Nations evidencing U.S.-citizen distaste for Castro and communism in Cuba. So we find these negotiations for ransom continuing and we find that even while Mr. Donovan is in Havana, Castro, himself, is proclaiming again, "I am a true Communist; I believe in communism." He is telling it to the world again, so there can be no doubt about it, he is a Communist, his country under his rule is Communist, and at the same time the United States is hoping and planning to pay him \$60 million for ransom of some prisoners through Mr. Donovan—which he will use to continue to keep all of Cuba a prison.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, today I sent a telegram to the President of the United States on this general subject. I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The apparent involvement of your administration with the rumored \$62 million ransom deal with Castro is disturbing. As an American citizen it disturbs me because if the rumors are correct, it is further evidence of the extent to which we have departed from the principles expressed by one of our prominent forefathers who was willing to provide "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." As a Member of the Congress, I am disturbed because this would be further admission on the part of your administration of its involvement in the Bay of Pigs tragedy. As a Senator, you were critical of the admission by President Eisenhower of our involvement in the U-2 incident. Yet that involvement certainly did not weaken our international prestige to the extent that your self-proclaimed failure in the Cuban invasion would do.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I am disturbed at the thought that in spite of the sentiments expressed and the

safeguards adopted in both the authorizing legislation and the appropriations bill for foreign aid, funds appropriated for foreign aid may be used for the purpose of paying ransom to a Red dictator.

I respectfully request that your administration divulge the extent to which it is involved in the negotiations of one James B. Donovan, a Democratic candidate for the Senate from the State of New York, for the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners. Specifically, I would like to have the amount of money which has been or will be committed to this purpose from foreign aid appropriations, and the categories of aid from which such commitments have been or will be made.

J. J. R.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true that under the Logan Act the negotiations of Mr. Donovan probably are not legal; in fact, as a lawyer, having read the act, I would say they probably are not legal. If this is the situation, the only thing the Attorney General of the United States could have promised, if indeed he promised Mr. Donovan anything, is immunity from prosecution?

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman is eminently correct.

I just happen to have a copy of the Logan Act before me which I placed in the RECORD in the discussion on the tractor deal, and the \$62 million deal previously. Here it is:

Title 18, United States Code, section 953: Private correspondence with foreign governments:

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield further, it follows that Mr. Donovan could not have been an agent of the U.S. Government for this purpose because the Attorney General could not have appointed him to carry on negotiations with a foreign government. Does it not follow that the only thing that Mr. Donovan could have received was the assurance of the Attorney General that under this administration, at least, he would not be prosecuted for the violation of the laws of the United States?

Mr. CRAMER. If his dealing had been with the Attorney General, under the language of the Logan Act it is my opinion that the Attorney General does not have power to give "the authority of the United States," and therefore if he is not able to give the authority to negotiate, which he obviously cannot do as Attorney General, that would have to come from the President or from the Secretary of State. Then the other thing that could be promised is what the gentleman is suggesting, and that is immunity

from prosecution, because the Attorney General or one of the family clan or family dynasty would be the one that would have to bring the prosecution. I think the gentleman is eminently correct.

I think this is a matter, because it has come up now two or three times in recent years under this administration, that should get, and should get immediately, the attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, because I do not know of a greater invasion of the rights of this body or the rights of Congress, the Senate in particular, that could be involved than to have a private person negotiating with a foreign government without the Senate of the United States, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, having a right to look at the agreement entered into through the constitutional process of ratification.

I think that is an invasion of the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the Congress of the United States, let alone it is an invasion of the proper functions of the executive branch of the Government, the President, and the executive having the sole authority to do business with foreign governments. I know of no leaders in Congress who have—in the usual tradition—been kept advised of negotiations with this enemy government. Is not even the Congress entitled to know?

I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs, at least, ought to look into this entire matter. It ought to call Mr. Donovan before it and ought to find out exactly what this deal is and how much it is going to cost the American taxpayer, and consider the serious questions involved that I have raised.

I was coming up here on a plane just the other day, and I read my hometown paper. Interestingly enough, it did not appear in the Washington Post. I read the St. Petersburg Times of Tuesday, October 9, 1962, when Mr. Dorticos was taking off on us, condemning the United States. Here was the Associated Press release from Havana carried in that newspaper, again I say not in the Washington Post:

The U.S. Government was reported to have supplied the difference in funds or the equivalent in supplies after Cuban exile organizations were unable to raise the amount demanded.

The article was referring to the ransom for the prisoners.

The ransom for the prisoners reportedly will consist of \$60 million worth of food and medicine which will be taken to Cuba in Cuban ships. Castro originally had demanded \$62 million for release of the prisoners.

Again:

The U.S. Government was reported to have supplied the difference in funds or the equivalent in supplies after Cuban exile organizations were unable to raise the amount demanded.

Further, from the press or otherwise my source of information because I have not gotten a reply to my wire asking that this matter be brought to public attention and asking what authority exists for such action. It clearly appears that the U.S. Government is being put by this administration in the wholly un-

tenable position, I might say unholy position, of negotiating with Fidel Castro for the relief of these prisoners in the amount of \$60 million worth of money or foodstuffs, and it is being done in direct contravention of the statement made to the Congress of the United States in very recent months. It makes our policy in regard to non-shipping to Cuba look just as foolish as it could be. It makes our foreign policy about as two-faced as it could be. I, for one, do not understand it, and feel it is my duty to protest it. Apparently, this administration has the attitude when it comes to prisoner ransom and release: American prisoners, no; Cuban prisoners, si. That is apparently the policy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Communism has been a failure throughout the world. But of all the areas in which it has failed, it has failed most dismally in the area of providing food for its own people.

Mr. CRAMER. Right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It seems we are now in the process of giving food to Poland and giving food to Yugoslavia and now food to Cuba, and that apparently we are trying desperately to make up for the shortcomings of the Communist world. I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for bringing this to the attention of the House and to the attention of the American people. This is certainly a situation which, if the rumors are correct, deserves to be corrected and deserves to be investigated by the appropriate bodies of this House.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman and may I ask the gentleman, does he know of any excuse why the administration would keep this super-secret and not make the negotiations public?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly do not, particularly when I remember how, during the previous administration, many people who are prominent in this administration were talking so much about the right to know, about freedom of information. I believe in the right to know on the part of the American people, and I hope the administration will begin to practice the extension of this right to know as so many of those people were preaching during the previous administration.

Mr. CRAMER. The New Frontier propagandists have been trying to make it appear that those who oppose this are not interested in the release of these prisoners, are somehow more patriotic than humane. I say categorically now and I said so in a resolution I introduced, I am interested in their release but I am equally interested in the release of all other prisoners with dignity and permanent freedom—without getting down on our knees to Castro—without humiliation. The way to release them is by recognizing a government-in-exile of the refugees and by supporting them. They would win back freedom for all Cubans.

This is not only my view, but when I introduced the resolution, House Concur-

rent Resolution 459, and the previous resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 479, I received a letter from Dr. Elpidio Garcia which I put in the RECORD. He happens to be a former prosecutor for the Government before the supreme court of Cuba and attorney general, and he joined me in opposing the ransom deal. Here is what he said about it:

A little over a year ago, a group of my fellow citizens, pledging their lives to their duty and their country, devoted themselves to the glorious task of reconquering their freedom and independence. The successful outcome of that valiant effort was prevented by reasons which are known to everybody. We are unable to render any other offering or tribute to the unselfishness and sacrifice of our captive brothers than our grief and self-denial as we see them imprisoned, but we cannot diminish the magnitude of their glory or of their service to the country by buying their freedom—the freedom of the unfortunate hostages in the hands of the wretch who seized them—or of the highwayman who imprisoned them—nor can we offer their hopes for freedom anything else but our unswerving determination to reconquer their freedom, even if it should cost us our lives.

Thank you very much, Mr. CRAMER, for the dignified, reasonable, and courageous bill presented by you to both the House and the Senate, which have had the good fortune of reading and which preserves the dignity of our prisoners, the honor of our fellow citizens, and the decorum of our brothers. Grateful Cuba will know how to thank you for your noble and honorable initiative. May the Lord grant the Cubans success in the final battle for our freedom, with the aid, cooperation, and stimulus of our invincible brothers, the Americans.

That is what even the Cubans feel about this abortive ransom deal. Let us hope the New Frontier does not make the United States party to another Cuban debacle as seems to be planned and underway. God help America if we continue to compromise our honor, our dignity, and dissipate our moral strength in this fight against atheistic communism as we have been doing in Cuba and are apparently bent on doing again.

I include my wire and ask for some answers:

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Regarding \$60 million foodstuffs and medicine exchange as ransom for Cuban prisoners which by all news reports is to include U.S.-owned, taxpayer-paid-for foodstuffs to make up the difference between volunteered funds and the \$62 million demanded, I strongly protest this or any expenditure of taxpayers' money through U.S.-owned foodstuffs for the ransom of Cuban prisoners as being contrary to the basic statement of policy by Congress calling for an authorizing specific action to rid this hemisphere of Castro and communism. In view of the strong public protest against the tractors-for-prisoners proposal, and in view of the downgrading of our prestige as the leading nation of the free nations of the world by thus admitting our participation in and backing of the Bay of Pigs invasion and our conciliatory attitude toward Castro, and hav-

1962

ing introduced resolutions opposing both the tractors deal and the \$62 million ransom deal, I feel I must express my deep concern and shock over the secret negotiations that are even yet not fully revealed between the United States, through a private citizen, and Castro. In view of the restrictive language written into the mutual security bill instructing the withholding of aid to countries that do business with Castro, and the House Cuban resolution calling for strong and affirmative action to get rid of Castro and the Communists, I am specifically requesting information as to what possible authority exists for the spending of any portion of the \$60 million by the Government of the United States in payment of ransom to the enemy Communist Fidel Castro and, further, even if such legal authority exists, which is unknown to me, how can the United States be put in the position of strengthening Castro and communism on the one hand by delivering shipments to Cuba of \$60 million worth of American substance, when calling on the other hand for all other countries to stop all other types of shipments to Cuba. How two-faced can our foreign policy objectives be? How inconsistent can our actions be? How confused the entire free world must be? Historically, the United States has never paid ransom or indemnity and this precedent will come to haunt the United States and the free world of the future. I am asking that this super-secret negotiation be called to a halt before irreparable damage to U.S. prestige is done. It is further inconceivable to me that, and I question the legality of, a private citizen, namely Mr. Donovan, would be allowed to negotiate with an enemy government on behalf of the United States—with the Castro government—declared to be an enemy government by the Congress in its resolution and by the President in invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act to prevent the importation of Havana tobacco of recent date. Such negotiations are considered a violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Logan Act and it has been the general policy of Congress to oppose any trade with the enemy as set forth in the Trading With the Enemy Act. The basic policies for freedom and against communism are all being violated, in my opinion, in this abortive deal—and I strongly protest making Castro stronger, our anti-Communist efforts a laughing stock throughout the world, and the establishment of a policy of paying taxpayer money to Castro for indemnity and ransom inherent in this supersecret deal, kept secret purposely and negotiated by a private citizen. I specifically ask these questions:

1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?

2. How much in U.S. owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?

3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?

4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?

5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the \$60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?

6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

No. 186 — 22

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

BONNEVILLE ELECTRIC POWER IN IDAHO MEANS INDUSTRIAL GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. FROST) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. FROST. Madam Speaker, for years the people of my State of Idaho have been seeking ways to expand opportunities for our businessmen, to spur our industrial growth, to create a stronger economy, and to widen the horizons of our children.

I am sincerely convinced, Madam Speaker, that if Idaho is to continue to move forward, and to keep pace with the rest of the Nation, we must bring low-cost electric power from the Federal Bonneville Dam into our State.

Two moves are in the making to do this. First, the Federal Government is considering action which will assure Idaho its fair share of Northwest public power, and second, the Congress has before it legislation to retain for the Northwest, first call on Northwest power. I am sponsoring both moves.

Now, there are those who say: "Let's keep low-cost Federal power out of Idaho."

I say: "Let's get our share."

Who is really fighting for the people of the State? I contend I am, and here in my hand is the proof.

These are Idaho Power Co. bills rendered within the last year to the citizens of Idaho. This bill is for \$11.50 for 800 kilowatt hours. In Milton-Freewater, just across the State line in Oregon, the charge for the same service—the same number of kilowatt hours—is \$7.63 percent more in Idaho than in Oregon.

Here is another one. It is for 1270 kilowatt hours. The cost in Idaho was \$18.88. It would have been only \$9.35 in Milton-Freewater, 102 percent more in Idaho.

Here are some other bills. This one is 62 percent higher, this one 65 percent, and this one 105 percent higher.

Kilowatt-hours	Idaho power cost	BPA cost through public utilities	Percent Higher	Higher
730	\$10.87	\$6.65	62	\$4.25
800	11.50	7.00	63	4.50
890	12.31	7.45	65	4.86
1,270	18.88	9.35	102	9.53
1,310	19.58	9.55	105	10.03

Why are these costs so much higher in Idaho than Oregon? Because Oregon has Bonneville Power, and in the area in which these bills were rendered, Idaho does not.

Let us look at some examples of what it costs to run a business in Idaho.

Westvaco Corp. of Pocatello paid the Idaho Power Co. \$3,110,500 for electricity in 1960. With BPA power they would

have saved \$1,380,000. How many jobs does that add up to?

In 1961, Monsanto Chemical Corp. paid \$2,807,799 to the Utah Power & Light Co., while Central Farmers paid this same company \$1,405,394. This is a total of almost \$7½ million.

If these three big phosphate companies had been served directly by Bonneville, they would have saved more than half of their power costs, or nearly \$4 million in 1 year.

Think what this much money could do to offset the high freight rates which plague the West, and how much more competitive it could make Idaho phosphates in a bigger marketing area—not to mention cheaper fertilizer for Idaho's own farmers. Convert that amount into plant facilities and monthly paychecks.

With lower Bonneville power rates Idaho phosphate companies could increase their production fourfold by 1980, create 3,000 new jobs in their plants and 6,000 new jobs in supporting industries and businesses. More out-of-State dollars would come into Idaho to help pay Idaho wages and Idaho taxes. Without low-cost power officials of these companies have made it clear that not only can there be no expansion in Idaho, but they may have to move their operations to another State.

I also say "let's get our share," because we are entitled to it.

Maybe you cannot tell by the color of the water, but that's Idaho water generating electricity at the Lower Snake and Columbia River Dams. Waters rising in Idaho produce almost 27 percent of the power at Ice Harbor, McNary, the Dalles and Bonneville Dams, and at John Day when it is completed.

This amounts to nearly 6 billion kilowatt hours per year. Six billion not million—"B" as in bread and butter. Yet, only 207 million kilowatt hours comes into Idaho, and that only in a few northern counties. And remember we are not talking about power that will be generated some time in the future, we are talking about power that is being generated today—this very minute.

Idaho water produces for others 33 times as much low-cost Federal power as Idaho now gets from BPA; 12 times as much as the Bureau of Reclamation produces in Idaho for Idaho.

Why are we not getting our share, and at rates homeowners and industries elsewhere in the Northwest are getting Federal power? Somebody is selling Idaho down the river.

What is worse we are being sold out by Idahoans—Idahoans who raise the phony arguments of "danger to our water rights," "unfair competition," and "who is going to pay the taxes?"

Idaho water rights will not be impaired by bringing Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho. Bonneville does not run the dams—the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers do that. Bonneville just sells the power. Here in Idaho, the Bureau of Reclamation will continue to make water releases in accordance with State laws. It is a well-established policy of the Bureau and the Corps of En-

gineers that irrigation rights come first, and power production must be consistent with such use.

Not once since the beginning has anybody in the Columbia Basin complained that the Bureau's operation of Grand Coulee Dam for the Bonneville Power system has kept needed water from the land.

Bonneville will provide competition for our private utilities, all right, but hardly "unfair competition." Just look at what has happened to the private utilities in Washington and Oregon who face Bonneville competition. Their rates are down, and their sales and profits and stock market values are up. They have learned how to make more money by selling more power at less cost. And none of them is applying for a 13-percent rate increase. They are selling residential power for less today than they did in 1938. Idaho Power Co. is not. But their profits are just as big at Idaho Power's. They have gained, and their customers have gained.

Taxes? As their sales and profits have gone up, so have the taxes of these private utilities outside Idaho. The same will be true of Idaho Power Co. when the competition of low-cost Federal power forces it to lower rates and increase sales. Idaho will not lose any taxes from Idaho Power Co., but will get more. Even more important, low-cost Federal power will create new taxable wealth, spread the tax burden, and keep your own taxes lower than they otherwise would be.

Low-cost power brings industrial growth that makes new payrolls and profits to be taxed. The industries attracted to Oregon and Washington and western Montana by low-cost Bonneville power generally are the biggest single taxpayers in their respective counties. Low-cost power creates the wealth that pays the taxes.

Now, as I have said, Madam Speaker, if we are going to get our share, two things must be done. First, we must get the Bonneville Power Administration's service area extended to include all of Idaho. Senator CHURCH, the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman HARDING, and I have asked that this be done. Secretary Udall, who has the authority to extend BPA service into all of Idaho, has directed BPA to make a feasibility study in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation. That study is now well underway, and we hope it will be favorable. If it is favorable, and if the people of Idaho indicate they want Bonneville service, the Secretary will issue the necessary marketing order.

Second, the House of Representatives must pass my regional preference bill which assures the Northwest of first call on all Federal power produced in the Northwest. The Senate has already passed a companion measure. At present, any power in excess of the needs of the Northwest could be sold elsewhere. Right now Bonneville's marketing area includes all of Washington, most of Oregon, western Montana, and the panhandle of Idaho. All those areas will be protected by this legislation. If southern Idaho is included in the BPA mar-

keting area, the legislation would extend the same protection to southern Idaho.

Advances in technology make this legislation absolutely necessary. Until very recently you could not transmit electric power, economically, more than 400 miles. There was no way for Northwest power to leave the Northwest. But today we can transmit electric city up to 1,000 miles, or even 2,000 miles, economically.

Further, existing law says Bonneville Power Administration shall sell its power anywhere within economic transmission distance, and give preference to public agencies. There are many number of public agencies within transmission distance who would like to have our power. If transmission lines are built, without regional preference legislation to protect us, these agencies could demand Northwest Federal power ahead of our industries, ahead of our private utilities, and on par with our own public utilities—municipalities, REA's, and so on.

Bonneville does not want to sell firm power elsewhere at the expense of Northwest customers. But Bonneville is willing and even anxious to sell its surplus secondary power to other areas. Unlike firm power, which is based on the lowest streamflows of record, secondary power cannot be guaranteed for delivery day in and day out, year in and year out because it is produced during high water periods.

As a result, there is practically no market for this kind of power in the Northwest. But there is a market for it in California as a cheaper substitute for electricity produced in steam plants that burn coal, oil, or gas. When low-cost northwest secondary power is available, these plants can be shut down, and fuel can be saved. When it is not available, these plants can be fired up again and electric service can be continued without interruption. California is willing to take our surplus power on that basis.

Bonneville is faced with the problem of either selling this secondary power wherever it can be sold, in order to help preserve its low rates, or to let it go to waste and raise rates. And rates are very important to us in the Northwest. It is not just an ample power supply, but an ample supply of low-cost power that attracts industries and makes jobs and builds our region.

As you may know, all Bonneville revenues go to the Federal Treasury to repay, with interest, the Federal Government's investment in Northwest power dams. Every year for its first 20 years, Bonneville always was ahead of schedule in repaying the Treasury. Five years ago BPA was, cumulatively, \$78 million ahead of schedule. But 5 straight deficit years have cut BPA's surplus to \$20 million. More annual deficits are threatened unless BPA can sell its secondary power. Ironically, in every deficit year BPA has had more unsold secondary power than the amount of the deficit. This secondary power could mean an extra \$15 million in revenue each year.

The danger is this: if Bonneville builds the lines or otherwise makes arrangements to sell this secondary power in California without regional preference

legislation being enacted first, California public agencies—under existing laws—can demand not only the Northwest's surplus secondary power, but firm power as well—power that is desperately needed here.

This is true whether the transmission lines be Federal or private.

Let us make one more point clear: This pending regional preference legislation does not authorize an intertie. BPA already has authority to sell anywhere within transmission distance. As a matter of fact, 3 years ago BPA was all set to hook up with a California private utility, and would have if the Senate Interior Committee, at the insistence of Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON and CHURCH, had not stopped them. These and other northwest Senators demanded that regional preference legislation be passed first, so the people of the Northwest would continue to have first call on northwest Federal power.

What this really gets down to is a case of protecting one of the Northwest's most valuable resources—its low-cost Federal power—rather than putting it in danger of export to California on a permanent and irrevocable basis. A vote against this legislation is a vote to risk the permanent sale of Northwest resources to other States. A vote for this legislation is a vote to protect our northwest resources and our people. That's why seven of the eight northwest Senators voted for regional preference legislation. I regret that our new Republican Senator from Idaho was the only northwest Senator who did not vote for this measure.

I have been fighting for it in the House of Representatives, along with most northwest Democrats in the House and most if not all the House Republicans from the Northwest.

We must keep BPA rates low. We must retain first call on northwest Federal power. And we must get Bonneville power into all of Idaho. This is the way to build our State. This is the way to make more business opportunities and more jobs for Idaho people—the way to make a future for our children and keep them in Idaho. This is the way to lower our electric bills. This is the way every Idahoan can add \$60, \$90, \$120 a year to his income by savings on his electric bills. This is the way to broaden our tax base.

This is the way the farmer, the homeowner, the worker, the businessman and, yes, even the Idaho Power Co. can profit and prosper in a healthy, vigorous, and growing Idaho economy.

THE 87TH CONGRESS—PROGRESSIVE AND IMPRESSIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. The record of the 2d session of the 87th Congress has indeed been both progressive and impressive. Legislative and administrative action has emerged which means so much to us nationally, internationally—